

Ancient Cēdi, Matsya, and Karūṣa.—By F. E. PARGITER, B.A., I.C.S.

(With a Map, Pl. XXV).

[Read August 1895.]

The ancient country of Cēdi is one of which little information is given in Sanskrit writings in comparison with the important part which its kings played in early history.

General Sir A. Cunningham in his *Archæological Survey of India* places Cēdi on the R. Narmadā (Nerbudda) and in Chattīsgarh. He says, 'Tewar or Tripura was the capital of the Kulachuri Rājās of Chedi. In the Haima Koṣa Tripura is also called Chedinagari. Amongst the Brahmans it is famous as the site of the defeat of the demon Tripura by Siva. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the place is of great antiquity; although it is probable that it was not the most ancient capital of the celebrated Chedi-des. At a very early period the whole of the country lying along the upper course of the Narbada would appear to have been occupied by the Haihaya branch of the Yādavas. In the Mahā-bhārata several different persons are mentioned as kings of Chedi; but as nothing is said about their relationship, they most probably belonged to different divisions of the country. It would seem therefore that, some time before the composition of the Mahābhārata, the land of Chedi had already been divided into two or more independent states, of which one belonged to Rājā Sisu-pāla, whose capital is not mentioned; and another to the father of Chitrāngadā, whose capital was Manipura. The capital of Chedi in the time of Rājā Vasu is said to have been situated on the Suktimati River, which according to the Purānas has its rise in the Riksha range of hills along with the Tons and the Narbada. In later times we know that there were two great Haihaya States in Central India, viz., the kingdom of Mahā Kosala with Manipur for its capital, and the kingdom of Chedi proper with Tripura for its capital. But as the Haihayas of Kosala date their inscriptions in the Chedi or Kulachuri Samvat by name, we have an additional proof that their country was

once included within the limits of the ancient Chedi. I incline therefore to look upon Manipur (to the north of Ratanpur) as the original capital of Chedi-des and to identify the Suktimati river with the Sakri which rises in the hills of the Kāwarda State to the west of Lāphā.' (Rep. Arch. Surv. IX. pp. 54 and 55). And the title Kulachuri or Kalachuri 'would seem to have been confined to the Tripuri branch of the Haihayas and its ramifications; while the Manipur kings, after the transfer of their capital to Ratanpur, were known as the Ratnavali Haihayas.' (*Ibid.*, p. 57). And again, 'as we learn from the Mahābhārata that the capital of Chedi was situated on the Suktimati river; and as we know that the Mahanadī flowed through the country of Chedi, I am more inclined to accept the Mahanadi as the representative of the Suktimati, and to place the capital of Kosala [Chedi?] on its banks.' (*Id.*, XVII. p. 24).

The notices of Cēdi, however, which are found here and there in the Mahā-bhārata and elsewhere shew very plainly that, whatever may have been the movements of the Cēdi princes in after years, the country of Cēdi in the Pāṇḍavas' time was very far north of the Narmadā and Mahānadī.

Cēdi was closely associated with Matsya. King Vasu, who established a dynasty in Cēdi, had a son called Matsya who became a king (M.-bh., Ādi-p., lxiii. 2371-93; and Hari-vamṣa, xxxii. 1804-6), and though it is not stated where Matsya reigned, yet it seems reasonable to suppose he reigned in Matsya. But putting that aside, it is stated positively that an ancient king Sahaja reigned over both the Cēdis and the Matsyas (Udyōga-p., lxxiii. 2732). Matsya as will be seen was the country south-west of Indra-prastha or Delhi, and it would have been impossible for one king to rule over that district and a kingdom on the Narmadā, whether the intervening region was peopled or covered with forest. This passage demonstrates that Cēdi must have touched Matsya.

Further the Cēdis are often joined with certain other people, as if forming a natural group; thus they are linked in one compound with the Matsyas and Karūṣas (*e.g.*, Bhīṣma-p., ix. 348; liv. 2242; and Karṇa-p., xxx. 1231), and with the Kāçis and Karūṣas (*e.g.*, Ādi-p., cxxiii. 4796; and Bhīṣma-p., cxvii. 5446). Kāçi was of course Benares; and the position of Matsya and Karūṣa may be determined here, because Lassen has placed them erroneously in his map (Ind. Alt.), Matsya north of Allahabad and Benares, and Karūṣa in the north of Oudh.

Brahmāvarta was the country between the rivers Saras-vatī on the north and Dr̥ṣad-vatī on the south and east (Manu II. 17). South and east of it lay Brahmar̥ṣi-dēça, which comprised Kuru-kṣētra,

Matsya, Pāñcāla and Āṇṣa (ibid., 19). Now Kuru-kṣētra, it is well-known, was the land south of the Dṛṣad-vatī; Pāñcāla comprised the middle portion of the Ganges and Jumna Doab; and Āṇṣa was the country around Mathurā, the modern Muttra. Matsya as part of Brahmarṣi-dēṇa touched Kuru-kṣētra on the south and Āṇṣa on the west. This will appear from the following references.

Matsya lay southward from Khāṇḍava-prastha or Indra-prastha, for the first two countries which Saha-dēva conquered in his Expedition to the Southern region were Āṇṣa and Matsya (Sabhā-p., xxx. 1105-6). Its position to the west of Āṇṣa is also brought out clearly by the description of the Pāṇḍavas' journey to the court of Virāṭa king of Matsya, when they had resolved on spending their last year of exile in concealment there; for crossing the Kālindī or Yamunā in the south portion of the Doab, they travelled north-westward, passing north of the Daṇṇas and south of the Pāñcālas and then through the Yakṣlōmas and Āṇṣas into Matsya (Virāṭa-p., v. 141-5).

These indications entirely bear out Cunningham's statement that Matsya was the country west of Agra and north of the R. Chambal (Rep. Arch. Surv. II. p. 242; and XX. p. 2 and Plate I); though it would perhaps be a little more precise to say Matsya comprised the modern State of Alwar with the country around it, and stretched southward as far as the R. Chambal, for it touched Cēdi there. South of Matsya were certain people called Aparā-Matsyas (Sabhā-p., xxx. 1108), and they very probably occupied the hilly tract on the north bank of that river, that is, they were the inhabitants of the southern portion of Matsya.

Such being the position of Matsya, it appears plain how there could have been frequent raids between Matsya and Trigarta which lay on the north of Brahmāvarta (Virāṭa-p., xxx); and how the Pāṇḍavas, when wandering about in the forests after they had been burnt out of Vāraṇāvata (Ādi-p., cxlviii.), visited the Matsyas, Trigartas, Pāñcālas and Kīcakas, which were the nations that surrounded the Kurus (id., clvi. 6084-7); and again how, when Ṣalya king of Madra (the capital of which, Ṣākala, was in the Rechna Doab between the rivers Chenab and Ravi—Sabhā-p., xxxi. 1196-7; and Cunningham's Arch. Surv. Repts., II. pp. 192-6) was marching to see the Pāṇḍavas in Matsya at the beginning of the great war, Duryōdhana had time to hear the news at Hāstina-pura and get an interview with him on the way, (Udyōga-p., vii).

The mention of the Matsyas in the description of Bhīma's conquests in the East region (Sabhā-p., xxix. 1081-2) is no doubt a mistake; whether it is a mistake for Vatsa, which was the country at

the south end of the Ganges and Jumna Doab with its capital at Kau-
çāmbī, the modern Kōsam (Arch. Surv. Repts., I. pp. 301–310), is
not clear, for Vatsa is definitely mentioned in *ibid.*, 1084. So also the
double mention of the Matsyas in the list of Indian peoples in the
Bhīṣma-p. (ix. 347 and 348) appears to be a mistake, and here there
can be little doubt that the name in the first of these verses should be
Vatsa (or Vātsya, as the people were also called), for otherwise the
Vatsas are not mentioned in the list at all.

The capital of Matsya was *Upa-plavya* or *Upa-plava* (Çalya-p.,
xxxvi. 1973–6). From there to Hāstina-pura was less than two days’
journey by chariot, for Kṛṣṇa in going from there to see Dhṛta-rāṣṭra,
started one day, reached a village Vṛka-sthala at evening, and went
on to Hāstina-pura next day (Udyōga-p., lxxxiii. 3010–17; lxxxv.
3040; and lxxxviii. 3101).

Now there are a few indications given in the Rāmāyaṇa regarding
the speed at which people could travel by chariot in ancient times.
Thus, the messengers who were despatched from Ayōdhyā express to
the Kēkaya capital Giri-vraja in the Panjab, to inform Bharata of his
father Daça-ratha’s death, accomplished the journey in just seven days
(Ayōdh.-k., lxx. 2–19); and Bharata in hastening back by a different
route spent seven nights on the way so that he completed the distance
within eight days (*Id.*, lxxiii. 2–17). Cunningham has identified Giri-
vraja with the modern Jalalpur on the Jhelam (Arch. Surv. Repts.,
II. pp. 14, 173–177), but it is not essential to the present purpose
whether this identification is perfectly correct or not, for it is quite
certain that the Kaikēya or Kēkaya country and Giri-vraja occupied
more or less nearly the position which he has assigned them. The
distance from there to Ayodhyā is about 650 miles in a direct line,
and may be taken to have been about 700 by road. The messengers
then travelled at about 100 miles per day, and Bharata at about 90.
Again, when Janaka king of Vidēha, sent messengers to Ayōdhyā to invite
Daça-ratha to Mithilā, they travelled in carriages driven fast and
reached Ayōdhyā on the fourth day (Ādi-k., lxx. 1). This distance
is about 200 miles, and the day’s journey would have been about 50 or
60 miles: this slower rate may be explained by the very reasonable
supposition that the roads to the east were not so good as those through
Madhya-dēça.

Upa-plavya therefore was probably not more than about 150 miles
from Hāstina-pura, and this distance would make Upa-plavya fall some-
where in the neighbourhood of Alwar or Bairāt. Cunningham says
Bairāt represents the ancient capital Vairāṭa, but I have met no passage
in the Mahā-bhārata which calls Upa-plavya by that name, and it does

not appear to be certain that the two names mean one and the same city; though it is of course very possible that the name derived from king Virāṭa may have superseded the older name. Lassen places Upaplavya on the site of the modern Amballa (Ind. Alt., Map).

We may now return to Cēdi. King Vasu, while out hunting one day, sent (it is fabled) a message home to his queen by a hawk, and the bird flew over the Jumna on its way to her (*Ādi-p.*, lxiii. 2373-87). Hence it appears Cēdi must have bordered on that river; the king could hardly go hunting in forest territory far from his realm; and it may even be inferred perhaps that the business entrusted to the bird implies that the king could not have been at a great distance from his capital. This fable, absurd as it is, yet must have a real and true ingredient of topography in it, for Satya-vatī dwelt on the banks of the Jumna and gave birth to Vyāsa on an island in that river (*Ibid.*, 2396-2426), and the story which explains the lineage and honour of queen Satya-vatī and the great Sage in a miraculous manner, yet harmoniously with ancient ideas, would not have given satisfaction unless it agreed with the well-known conditions of the country.

Cēdi is said to be one of the countries around the Kurus when the Pāṇḍavas debated where they should spend the last year of their exile (*Virāṭa-p.*, i. 11-12); and Yudhiṣṭhira names the Cēdis with the Kāçis, Pāñcālas, and Matsyas as the nearest nations with whose friendly intervention he chose five villages for his kingdom of Indra-prastha (*Udyōga-p.*, lxxi. 2594-5). And, as has been mentioned already, Cēdi touched Matsya. It is said to be in the eastern region when Bhīma went forth on his expedition to conquer the east (*Sabhā-p.*, xxviii. 1069-74); but it was in the southern portion of that region, for it is connected with the Daçārṇas (who dwelt on the modern river Dasān in Bundēlkhaṇḍ) and with the Pulindas (who appear to have dwelt south of the Daçārṇas)

All these conditions can only be satisfied by placing Cēdi along the south bank of the Jumna from the R. Chambal on the north-west about as far as Karwi (which is north-east of Citra-kūṭa) on the south-east; and its limits southward would have been the plateau of Malwa and the hills of Bundēlkhaṇḍ. Cēdi is placed in the south in the story of Arjuna's following the sacrificial horse over India (*Āçva-mēdh.-p.*, lxxxiii. 2466-9), and the position now proposed will satisfy this passage also. The Yakṛllōmas, who have been mentioned above in connexion with Matsya, were probably a tribe dwelling along the north of the Cēdi territory, for, beyond that they are named in *Bhīṣma-p.*, ix. 353, they are hardly to be found alluded to elsewhere.

The capital of Cēdi is said in the *Mahā-bhārata* to be Çukti-matī.

(Vana-p., xxii. 898), or as it was also called by way of variety Çukti-sāhvayā (Āçva-mēdh.-p., lxxxiii. 2466-7). It was situated on the R. Çukti-matī, for it is said the river flowed towards the city, and a legend was told that Mount Kōlāhala, being in love with the river, obstructed her, but king Vasu gave the mountain a kick and the river flowed out through the passage made by the blow (Ādi-p., lxiii. 2367-70). Cunningham's identification of the river and city has been quoted above, and Mr. Beglar has proposed another solution (Arch. Surv. Repts., VIII. pp. 123-125), but they do not agree with the position now found for Cēdi, nor with the further data which I now proceed to discuss.

The Çukti-matī river is said in the Purāṇas to rise in the Vindhya range, and not in the Rkṣa range as Cunningham says. There is some confusion between the two ranges in the Purāṇas, largely through errors of transmission, and partly also because the two ranges form a kind of knot at Amara-kaṇṭaka, where the Narmadā, Sone and Mahānadī in its Seonath branch (which was formerly considered the main stream) rise, and these rivers were held to rise in the Vindhya Mountains; but looking at the other rivers assigned to these two watersheds, the Çukti-matī is grouped with the Daçārnā (Dasan), Citra-kūṭā (near Mount Citra-kūṭa), Vipāçā (Bias, a tributary of the Ken), Tamasā (Tons) and Viçālā (at Gaya), all of which unquestionably rise in the long Vindhya chain; and not with the Tāpī (upper part of the Tapti), Payōṣṇī (Purna and lower part of the Tapti), Vēṇā or Vēṇyā (Wain-ganga) and Vaitaraṇī (Bytarni) which unquestionably rise in the Rkṣa range. The actual grouping decides this matter, and not the mere text of the Purāṇas which may be and is full of mistakes; thus the Matsya Purāṇa (cxiii. 25-28) and the Kūrma (xlvii. 30-33) wrongly interchange the names of the two ranges, making the former group of rivers rise in the Rkṣa Mountains and the latter in the Vindhya; while the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (lvii. 21-25) makes the same mistake as to the second group and declares the first group rise in the Skandha range, when there are no such Mountains! These errors and the not infrequent jumble of names are no doubt due to the ignorance of transcribers; for it is a remarkable fact that the early Sanskrit writers had a much better knowledge of the Geography of India than their successors; the Rāmāyaṇa and Mahā-bhārata contain a considerable quantity of fairly accurate information, while the Raghu-vaṃṣa, Çiçupāla-badha and modern poems are singularly barren in this respect.

The R. Çukti-matī then rises in the Vindhya Mts.; and it must be noted that in the Purāṇa lists this name includes the hills about as far west only as Saugor where the Daçārnā rises, for the next im-

portant river westward the Vētra-vatī (Betwa) is assigned to the Pāripātra watershed. Presumably then the Çukti-matī must be east of the Daçārṇā, and the only noteworthy river in that direction which breaks through the hills is the Ken. I have not been able to discover any Sanskrit name for the Ken. Lassen gives its ancient name as Kāyana (Ind. Alt., Map), and Cunningham says Ken or Kayān is a corruption of Karṇa-vatī (Arch. Surv. Repts., II. p. 446, and XXI. p. 156); but I have not met with either of these names anywhere else, nor are they mentioned in Prof. Sir M. Monier-Williams' Dictionary. Now the Ken is too large and important a river to have escaped being noticed and named, especially when its western-most tributary was called the Vipāçā (Bias). Putting these facts together then, it seems to me the Ken must be the Çukti-matī. It breaks through the hills between Panna and Bijawar in a way that suits the legend, and it flows through the country, which on quite different reasoning has been identified as Cēdi. The results of these two entirely independent lines of argument certainly corroborate each other, and the reasons for accepting this identification, to which I have been led solely in the course of working out the foregoing data, appear to be very strong.

Mount Kōlāhala then would be the hills between Panna and Bijawar; it is not a single hill, for that would hardly suit the legend, and moreover the Sanskrit words *parvata*, *giri*, &c., often denote a cluster or group or chain of hills, while *çikhara*, *gr̥ga*, &c., are more properly the terms for a single hill or peak.

The capital Çukti-matī then must have been situated on the Ken after it breaks through the hills, but its exact site can only be discovered by careful local inquiry and the aid of large maps. It may, however, be placed provisionally in the neighbourhood of Banda, for that would be about the most suitable position for a capital with regard to the configuration of the country.

We may next consider the position of Karūṣa. The word is also written Kāruṣa, Kārūṣa, and Kāruṣaka. The Karūṣas constituted a powerful nation under king Danta-vakra in the Pāṇḍavas' time (Sabhā-p., xiii. 575-7; and Hari-v., xci. 4963), and the royal line was a famous one (Ādi-p., lxvii. 2700); yet they seem to have consisted of several tribes, for Karūṣa "kings" are spoken of (Udyōga-p., iii. 81). The Karūṣas were not looked upon as closely allied to the nations around them, for their origin is carried in the Hari-vamṣa directly back to an eponymous ancestor Karūṣa, a son of Manu Vaivasvata (x. 614; and xi. 658).

The position of Karūṣa is indicated by the following allusions. It is linked with Cēdi and Matsya as already mentioned: with Kāçi

(Bhīṣma-p., lvi. 2415); with Cēdi and Kāçi as already mentioned; and with the Vātsyas or Vatsas (Droṇa-p., xi. 396) whose position has been stated above. Moreover king Danta-vakra acknowledged Jarāsandha king of Magadha (*i.e.*, the modern districts of Gayā and Patna) as his suzerain (Sabhā-p., xiii. 575-7; and Hari-v., xci. 4963). Viçvā-mitra, when taking the youthful Rāma to slay the Yakṣiṇī Tāḍakā, crossed from the R. Sarayū to the south of the Ganges and entered the modern district of Shāhābād; and said that that region had once been inhabited by the Malajas and Karūṣas (Rāmāy., Ādi-k., xxvii. 8-23). Lastly Karūṣa is described in the Mahā-bhārata as a country not very accessible (Sabhā-p., li. 1864): and the Mārkaṇḍēya Purāṇa says distinctly that Karūṣa is one of the countries touching the Vindhya Mts. which stretch from Malwa into Bihar (lvii. 52-53), and so also the Matsya Purāṇa (cxiii. 51-52).

Karūṣa therefore was a hilly country and lay south of Kāçi and Vatsa, between Cēdi on the west and Magadha on the east, and enclosing the Kaimur hills which are part of the Vindhyas; that is it comprised all the hilly country of which Rewa is the centre, from about the river Ken on the west to the confines of Bihar on the east. It would have touched Cēdi on its north-west and Daçārṇa on its west.

The passage cited from the Rāmāyaṇa suggests that the Karūṣas originally inhabited the Shahabad district and the region of the lower Sone, and had been driven out shortly before Rāma's time southward and south-westward into the hilly country which is shewn to have been their territory in the Pāṇḍavas' time and afterwards; but as all the country was dense forest about Prayāga and Citra-kūṭa in Rāma's time (J. R. A. S., 1894, pp. 238-241), it may also be inferred that the Karūṣas had not then acquired all that territory, but were spreading westwards over it gradually.

We may next notice the information which is to be gleaned regarding the dynasty which reigned over Cēdi. It began with Vasu, who was surnamed Upari-cara, and who took possession of the country at Indra's command (Ādi-p., lxiii. 2334-5). From the description given of it, it appears to have been a flourishing land already; so that Vasu did not carve out a new realm, but must have invaded an attractive country and possessed himself of the sovereignty of it, in commemoration whereof he established a festival in Indra's honour (*ibid.*, 2340-5 and 2361). He was not a Haihaya, but a Paurava as the first of these passages shews, though no further allusion is made to his parentage. There is some divergence as to the period when he lived. As father of Satya-vatī he would have been contemporary with Bhīṣma's father Çāntanu or grand-father Pratīpa; yet the Hari-varṇa also

throws him five generations back by making her the fourth ancestress of Brahma-datta, king of Kāmpilya, who was Pratīpa's contemporary (xviii. 967-81; and xx. 1047); and again places him midway between these two periods by the genealogy which it gives of his descendants (xxxii. 1804-10).

The kingdom which Vasu founded was a powerful one. He annexed the neighbouring territories, chiefly to the east, and placed his five sons who were called the Vāsava kings there. They established separate dynasties, of which only two however are clearly mentioned, *viz.*, Vṛhad-ratha ruled over Magadha, with Aṅga seemingly as an appanage, and Kuṣa (or Kuṣamba) Maṇi-vāhana reigned presumably in Kauṣāmba (Ādi-p., lxiii. 2362-5; and Hari-v., cxvii. 6598). Which son succeeded him in Cēdi is not stated, nor where the two other sons reigned; but it is highly probable that Karūṣa was the territory ruled by one of them, for its position midway between Cēdi and Magadha would have necessitated its conquest before Magadha, and the strong friendship between the kings of the three countries (Sabhā-p., xiii. 571-5; and xlvii. 1570) and the alliances by marriage (Hari-v., xxxv. 1927, and 1930-2) indicate a close connexion between these dynasties. I may note here that the king Vasu mentioned in Rāmāyaṇa, Ādi-k., xxxv. 1-9, appears to be quite a different monarch, and prior in time to Vasu Upari-cara.

The next king of Cēdi mentioned after Vasu was Dama-ghōṣa, who was probably fourth or fifth in descent from him. He married Kṛṣṇa's aunt, and his son was Çiṣu-pāla, the famous king of Cēdi, whom Kṛṣṇa slew (Hari-v., xxxv. 1927-31; xcv. 5256; and cxvii. 6599-6600). Çiṣu-pāla was also called Su-nītha (Hari-v., cviii. 6029; cxvii. 6594-6608). Çiṣu-pāla's son and successor was Dhṛṣṭa-kētu (Udyoga-p., clxx. 5900) who joined the Pāṇḍavas in the great war and was killed there. He was succeeded in the throne by his younger brother Çarabha (Āçva-mēdh.-p., lxxxiii. 2468-9), and with him the curtain falls on the stories of those stirring old times.

I do not find any indications, as Cunningham alleges, that several different persons are mentioned as being kings of Cēdi at the same time. Allusions are made to other kings of Cēdi besides those whom I have just noticed, but they refer to earlier monarchs who belonged to times prior to Vasu Upari-cara. For instance, the king of Daçārṇa had two daughters, one of whom married Vīra-bāhu king of Cēdi, and the other Bhīma king of Vidarbha; and the latter's daughter was Dama-yantī who married king Nala (Vana-p., lxix. 2707-8). Vīra-bāhu appears to be the same king who is called Su-bāhu Satya-darçin (*id.*, lxv. 2576). Nala's story however belongs to times long prior to the Pāṇḍavas: this is plain from the way in which the story is told, his down-

fall being a well-known example (see *id.*, xiii. 601); and he is made a contemporary of Rtu-parṇa or Rta-parṇa king of Ayōdhyā, who is placed about 34 generations above the Pāṇḍavas' time in the genealogy in the Hari-varṇa (xv. 814-30); and Damayantī's father Bhīma is placed about 25 generations prior to that era in the same book (xxxvii. 1989-xxxviii). This allusion to Cēdi bears out the remarks made in the third previous paragraph that Cēdi was a flourishing land before Vasu's time, and that he must have entered it by conquest. I am not aware of any passage in the Mahā-bhārata which connects Maṇi-pūra and king Citra-vāhana father of Citrāṅgadā with Cēdi or Chattisgarh; rather, it is strongly suggested that Maṇi-pūra was on the eastern sea-coast south of Kalinga (Ādi-p., ccxv. 7823-4).

NOTE.—Since writing the above I have found some genealogical information regarding the Cēdi kings in the Matsya Purāṇa. Cēdi is derived from an eponymous king Cidi, grandson of Vidarbha, who it is said founded the kingdom of Vidarbha, and great grandson of Jyāmagha who conquered and reigned over the country along the Narmadā and the Rkṣa Mts. (xliv. 28-38). These kings were descended from Krōṣṭu, son of Yadu, while the Haihayas were the descendants of Haihaya, grandson of Yadu's son Sahasra-ji (xliii. 4-7; and xlv. 14).

The 50th canto contains the genealogy of Vasu Upari-cara. He is said to be fourth in descent from king Kuru, son of Saṁvaraṇa, of the Paurava race (20-26), and is placed 14 reigns anterior to the Pāṇḍavas (20-23, and 34-50) and is made the ninth ancestor of their contemporary Jarāsandha (26-32).

These statements indicate that the kingdom of Cēdi was founded as an offshoot from the south by the Yādavas of Vidarbha; and after it had lasted through some 20 or 25 reigns, Vasu Upari-cara, the Paurava-kaurava, from the north invaded and conquered the country and established his own dynasty in it.